

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are now pending in the application. The amendments to the claims contained herein are of equivalent scope as originally filed and, thus, are not a narrowing amendment. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection(s) in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claims 1, 4 and 9 stand objected to for certain informalities. Applicants have amended these claims according to the Examiner's suggestions. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-4, 8-10 and 14-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arakawa et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,176,321) in view of Dochterman (U.S. Pat. No. 3,997,805). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent Claim 1 recites "a resilient O-ring located on the motor plate . . . and a resilient sealing ring moulded onto the motor plate." The rejection notes that Arwakawa et al. does not disclose these features but points to Dochterman as providing them. Specifically, the rejection states: "Dochterman teaches resilient O-ring (43 fig. 1) and a resilient sealing ring (22 fig 1) on motor plate (19)." In reality, however, there is no resilient O-ring 43 in Figure 1 of Dochterman. Instead, the seal 43 of Dochterman is actually an alternative embodiment for the seal 22 of Dochterman as illustrated in Figure 4. Thus, Dochternan discloses the use of either seal (22) or seal 43, but not both in an

electric motor. Thus, neither Arakawa et al. nor Dochterman disclose or suggest Applicants' invention as defined by Claim 1.

Independent Claim 9 recites "a motor plate having a central opening . . . a metal ring . . . located within the central opening of the motor plate . . . and a resilient sealing ring moulded onto the metal ring . . . for sealing between the metal ring and the armature shaft." The rejection points to Arakawa et al. as having "a motor plate (adjacent gear housing) having an opening (slot) for shaft (10) . . . and a metal ring defining a hole (ring shaped slot in plate.)" as disclosing these features. In reality, however, there is no motor plate having a central opening and also a metal ring located within that central opening as recited in Claim 9, since this rejection points to only one plate/ring part. Furthermore, to the extent a resilient sealing ring is present in either Arwakawa et al. or Dochterman, it does not seal between any metal ring and the armature shaft () as recited in Claim 9. Thus, neither Arakawa et al. nor Dochterman disclose or suggest Applicants' invention as defined by Claim 9.

Since each of the remaining rejected claims (Claims 2-4, 8, 10 and 14-16) depend from one of independent Claims 1 or 9, either directly or indirectly, Applicants respectfully assert that they are likewise patentable for at least the reasons discussed above.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner states that claims 5, 6, 11-13 and 17 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicants believe that all of the claims herein are patentable for at least the reasons discussed above.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 8 AUG 2005

By: 
Michael E. Hilton, Reg. No. 33,509

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MEH/pvd